

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,438.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's allegedly "admitted prior art" (hereinafter "APA") in view of Norman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,719,589) (hereinafter "Norman") and further in view of Young et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,075,596) (hereinafter "Young").

Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Norman and Young and further in view of Van de Ven (U.S. Patent No. 5,812,105) (hereinafter "Van de Ven").

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended claims 13 and 15 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application's specification and/or to improve the form of the claims. Accordingly, claims 13-15 remain pending for consideration.

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,438.

Applicants have amended claim 13 in order to describe an apparatus for driving a multi-color light-emitting display panel that includes, in combination, a number of advantageous features

that renders the claims of the instant application particularly different from the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,438. Accordingly, withdrawal of the double patenting rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Norman and further in view of Young. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over APA in view of Norman and Young and further in view of Van de Ven. Applicants have amended claims 13 and 15 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application's specification and/or to improve the form of the claims. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants have amended independent claim 13 to describe an apparatus for driving a multi-color light-emitting display panel that includes, in combination, a number of advantageous features. For example, in newly-amended independent claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that because the drive current and the third potential are variable, in the capacitive light-emitting elements of red, green and blue, relationships of $V_{eR} > V_{eG} > V_{eB}$ and $V_R > V_G > V_B$ are set in order to improve the rise characteristic of light emission of the capacitive light-emitting elements. Applicants respectfully submit that neither of the applied Norman and Young references teaches, or even suggests, these associated features as described in newly-amended independent claim 13.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn because none of the applied art of record, whether taken singly or

combined, teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 13, as amended. MPEP § 2143.03 instructs that “[t]o establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 409 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974).” Furthermore, Applicant respectfully asserts that dependent claims 14 and 15 are allowable at least because of their dependence from claim 13, and the reasons set forth above. Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that the additionally applied reference to Van de Ven, with respect to claim 15, does not cure the deficiencies discussed above with regard to the primary references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including

any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.


This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP

Dated: April 26, 2006

By:



Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465